Vol. XI, No. 26 HUMAN EVENTS June 30, 1954

U OF MINN SPEC COLL JUL 8 1954

THE BLACKBIRD OF DISASTER

By WILLIS J. BALLINGER

NOW THAT Sir Winston Churchill is again officially on our shores there is a side to his glamorous career that might well be examined. If, as someone has remarked, there is no such thing as a cheap politician, there are able scholars and observers — both here and in England — who are certain that he will go down in history as one of the most costly politicians of all time.

Actually there have been two Churchills on the public stage and the captivating popular talents of the one have obscured and kept too long in the shadows the failure and menace of the other. One is Churchill the supreme orator, polished man of letters, unexcelled raconteur, delightful epigrammist — the colorful figure with his inevitable black cigars, masterful platform presence and magnetic vitality. The other is Churchill, the politician whose decisions have been so monotonously calamitous as to pin on him the sobriquet — "the blackbird of disaster."

Although Churchill once exclaimed that he was not put in office to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, those who have been keeping track of the political Churchill are certain that no one has done more to promote that end, and that his consistent genius for political blundering has been the decisive factor in reducing England to a second-rate power with an even more dubious future. These critics are also persuaded that no foreigner has ever exerted a more baneful influence on the fortunes of the American people.

1. The first major and costly step in the decline of England was her participation in the European war of 1914. Churchill, a member of the British Cabinet which took England into that war, was all for it. He regarded Germany as a dangerous military and commercial competitor of his country — a monster, therefore, to be crushed as menacing civilization. Top historians have long established that the European conflagration of 1914 was not the unique responsibility of the Kaiser, by any means. They place German responsibility for the outbreak secondary to Russian mobilization incited by French intrigue. The French wanted to recover through war with Germany the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine while the Russian land-grabbers wanted Constantinople — an age-old objective of Russian foreign policy. Revisionist scholars contend that England could have prevented war by putting pressure on both France and Russia.

But she sat by until Russian mobilization had forced Germany to strike in self-defense. Then she rushed into the war on the trumped-up emotional plea that she had

Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an obligation to defend Belgian neutrality — a plea that has since been conclusively exploded. Did not England during the war force King Constantine of Greece from his throne for insisting on the neutrality of his country? But the British pretense fooled a lot of Americans into believing that England's motive for going to war was idealistic and selfless.

Publication of the secret treaties of the Allies revealed their scarcely idealistic incentive for the conflict — territorial aggrandizement (an old story in European politics). England received as her share of the loot an area of some one million square miles — about one-third the size of the United States. Now Churchill was a fervent believer in that school of British patriotism which regarded territorial aggrandizement, by whatever means, as the hallmark of British growth and greatness. His father before him had declared in Parliament that British acquisition of India "more than all our Colonial dominions has raised in power, in resources, in wealth and in authority this small island home of ours far above the level of the majority of nations — has placed it on an equality with — perhaps even in a position of superiority — over every other Empire either of ancient or modern times."

But World War I blew to bits an established liberal-conservative order in Europe — one that had made astonishing progress along sound lines of moderation and pragmatism. Today, that seems nostalgically a sane world when "red was only a color and Hiss was only a sound." World War I gave Communism its opportunity in Russia and unleashed destructive forces of totalitarianism everywhere in the old world. But striking England at the very heart of her national vitality was the burial of more than a million British soldiers — the flower of her youth — in Flanders' fields. From this staggering biological blow England, even under the best circumstances, needed a long convalescence.

2. World War II shattered the once powerful world influence of England. After that conflict, the English had to part with India, and give up their influence in Afghanistan, and their economic power in China. Their oil was in danger in Iran, their persuasive guidance in Arabic countries was greatly diminished and the ultimate loss of the Suez Canal loomed. Many may hail the disintegration of the British Empire, but one must observe that its collapse opened wide the door for Russian imperialism, a far more terrible imperialism. Sadly stripped of her former global influence England emerged from the war with many markets permanently lost, a lower domestic standard of living — and, worse yet, under the shadow of a colossal Russia toward whom she has had to increasingly bend the knee. These catastrophic consequences of World War II on England can be charged directly to Churchill, say his critics.

After Churchill became Prime Minister, Hitler and Stalin collided in 1941. England could have gotten out of the war in that year with very favorable terms from Hitler (as the Hess mission proved) and let the totalitarian powers battle themselves to exhaustion. But Churchill refused. Why was he so bent on war? Professor Charles Tansill, the eminent American historian, offers one explanation. While he was still a minister in the Chamberlain Cabinet (1939-41) after England had entered the war, the gist of one of his numerous cablegrams to Roosevelt was "Should I become Prime Minister of Britain, *you and I could control the world.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Captain Grenfell, in his masterful work *Unconditional Hatred,* says that Churchill believed Germany to be the "world's pest" — that if Germany "could be crushed and kept crushed" the world would at once become peaceful and remain so. Grenfell shows the falsity and tragedy of this myth which had enslaved Churchill's mind — and points out that Churchill's thesis was promptly disproven when Germany was defeated and the Russian bear stood up on his hind legs with bared teeth.

3. During the war Churchill's critics charge that he retrogressed from just a blundering politician into virtually a political Mephistopheles "whose conscience ceased to be his guide and became his accomplice."

England had gone to war with Hitler in 1939 because of two solemn pledges to protect Poland's pre-war boundaries. But, at Teheran and Yalta, Churchill *took the initiative* in sanctioning Russian acquisition of one-half Polish territory and allowed the rest to fall under Russian control through a puppet government.

At Potsdam, Churchill approved extension of the boundaries of this puppet Poland — an act which uprooted some 14 million persons of German ethnic origin from land they had occupied for centuries and confiscated their property, a decision denounced by historian William Henry Chamberlin as "one of the most barbarous acts of history." Some two million people are estimated to have perished in this vast territorial surgery — either murdered by the Russians or dead of hunger, cold and starvation.

At Yalta, the use of *slave labor* of German war prisoners was sanctioned — a reversion to one of the most savage practices of antiquity. Churchill was, of course, at Yalta, and today hundreds of thousands of German war prisoners are pitiful slaves in Russia.

At Teheran, Churchill took the initiative in betraying General Mihailovich, the anti-Communist pro-West leader, and Yugoslavia to the Moscow-trained Tito. After the war Tito announced a break with the Kremlin and (with liberal handouts from our Treasury) professes to be an ally of the free world. Astute observers, however, question the genuineness of his break with Stalin and whether he would really fight Russia.

At Quebec, as John T. Flynn puts it, "the Morgenthau plan to ruin Germany after the war which had been prepared by a Communist agent in our government (Harry Dexter White) was forced on Churchill *with a bribe of six and one-half billion dollars of post-war aid to England.*" A part of this plan, subsequently carried out, called for a division of Germany in accordance with Russian plans. In agreeing to a division of Germany, Churchill — by this one act alone — may have sealed the doom of Western Europe and his own country. Without German legions, NATO is hopeless.

But today German leaders fed up with French rebuffs to their offer to rearm, indignant over French intentions to retain the Saar region (German for centuries) and seeing little hope of reunion with their kin in Eastern Germany are beginning to look to Russia for achieving this end. And Russia's opportunity is there. By permitting West and East Germany to reunite, scaring off the French in the Saar, Russia could afford to treat Germany decently in return for all-out German industrial cooperation to raise standards of living in Russia (her most pressing problem). Backed by German military

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power and German technical proficiency the Kremlin could insure its domination of Western Europe — a domination which England could not withstand.

WAS CHURCHILL FORCED to do what he did at Teheran, Quebec, Yalta and Potsdam? In betraying Poland and Yugoslavia Churchill himself *took the initiative.* At Quebec *he took a "bribe"* for sanctioning the partition of Germany.

Did the Russians scare him into what he did by threatening a separate peace with Germany? Such a peace was highly unfeasible. But the Russian threat could have been easily turned back on the Russians — because Germany would have been happy to surrender to the British, to deliver up Hitler and his Nazis without hesitation and at a time (says the British historian Grenfell) when German troops could have kept the Reds out of East Germany and other vital areas. But Churchill by subscribing to Roosevelt's "unconditional surrender" formula, tied his own hands.

Was Churchill intimidated by Roosevelt into fattening up the Kremlin? If he was, one would expect him to say so honestly in his memoirs. But in his memoirs he says of Roosevelt: "I conceived an admiration for him *as a statesman,* as a man of affairs and as a war leader. I felt the utmost confidence in his upright character and outlook, his love for his own country and his *respect for its Constitution."* (Our italics.)

4. Since 1952, when he returned to power in England, his critics say Churchill has progressively emerged as "water boy" for the Kremlin. His government continued its recognition of Red China, permitted British merchants to trade vigorously with our enemy in the Korean war, championed admission of Red China to the UN, forced us to accept armistice terms in Korea practically dictated by the Reds, and thereafter, as spokesman for his administration declared England's intention of trading as much as possible with all Communist countries and urged that we end our trade embargo with Communist countries.

Only last year the aging Winston said that the United States should think up more agreeable things to do for the Soviets. He also declared that he believed Russian satellite states were *indispensable to the military security of Russia* — a judgment of doom for their enslaved peoples which Senator Taft attacked before he died. And now, recently at the Primrose Club in London, Churchill intoned: "Britain wants the USSR (Russia) *to play a proud and splendid role in guiding humanity."*

Sir Winston has paid us a visit with the frightening purpose of advising Eisenhower on how best to tie Downing Street and the White House still closer together. Scholars who have contemplated the above records of the political Churchill — the "blackbird of disaster" — are wondering if he will live just long enough to drag us down in ruin as he has his own people through his formidable talent for political blundering.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Vol. XI, No. 26 Wednesday, June 30, 1954 Washington, D. C.

The Four-Party System: There's something wrong with the following mosaic of the political scene — that is, if you believe in the two-party system.

(1) Two days ago, Democratic Senator Eastland of Mississippi called for a crusade for states rights. His theme, if not terminology, was only a little different from the plea just a month ago, of Republican Senator Jenner of Indiana. Yet Eastland did not refer to Jenner and Jenner hasn't publicly noted the similarity between his views and those of the gentleman from Mississippi.

(2) In the past 24 hours in the debate on foreign aid, Republican Representative Lawrence Smith of Wisconsin, launched a critical blast against the Eisenhower Administration's foreign aid bill. Across the aisle (that is on the Democratic side of the floor), Representative Winstead (of Mississippi) rose a few minutes later to virtually echo the Smith objections, while Republican Representative Javits of New York defended the White House-supported measure.

(3) Washington today is still talking of the recent bitter attack on Governor Dewey which came from the lips of Mr. Richard Balch. It is true that this gentleman is a Democrat and head of that party's state committee in the Empire state. But the smart boys are saying that Balch had one eye cocked on the old Taft following among N.Y. Republicans, who (like most of that element throughout the nation) literally hate Dewey as much as does Balch. Maybe Balch hoped that some of these discontented Republicans would stay home next November if Dewey runs again for Governor.

(4) Who does Mr. Balch want to run against Dewey? Probably Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., the rising hope of the Democrats for 1956. Yet such sentiments are scarcely shared by a Southern Democratic Senator, a great leader in his party. The latter, contemplating the possibility that F.D.R. Jr., might win the New York Governorship and then go on to the Presidency in 1956, was heard to vow he would return to private life if that happened. "If we get another Roosevelt," he groaned, "one who is even farther left than his father, then I'm signing off."

(5) A national GOP leader recently canvassed the sentiments of 72 Republican House members up for re-election next fall, across the country. He asked them if they wanted help from the Citizens for Eisenhower organization which tub-thumps loudly for strict obedience to the program of Eisenhower (or rather of the White House Palace Guard). Sixty replied "no"; only twelve said "yes."

It is crystal clear — the two old parties are split wide open. We have a four-party system, or rather a four-party chaos, the usual thing in multi-party situations the world over. The stage is set for realignment of conservatives on the one hand, of "liberals" on the other. Yet not a prominent voice is lifted to point out the crying discrepancy of the present party setup. That's really what's worst in what's wrong with this picture.

Not Merely Gossip: When Churchill landed in the U.S. last week, he expected that he would (as previously) be invited to address the two Houses of Congress. But he learned from U.S. diplomats that such an invitation would not be extended to him for a large number of members of Congress would conspicuously absent themselves from any such welcoming joint session, thereby creating an international incident. For a sample of congressional feeling against Churchill, note the acidulous speech of Senator McCarran on the floor of the Senate on June 28 which received little notice in the press.

Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● Those who know the long background of the Oppenheimer case give preponderant credit to Atomic Energy Chairman Lewis Strauss for his determined battle over the past seven years to bring that scientist to book. The gallant former Admiral (friend of Hoover and Taft) braved the bitter opposition and smearing of the "liberal" press, but did not falter in his stand against Oppenheimer. In the last 24 hours, he cast his vote at the head of a majority in the Commission to bar secrets from the scientist. The decision is regarded here as a bad blow to the prestige of the "liberals" who fought tooth and nail to shield Oppenheimer.

● Curious but true, not one Tory official from Churchill up or down has criticized the trip projected by Labor party leaders to Red China. Former Labor Premier Attlee and now head of the Labor party, and Aneurin Bevan, left wing leader of the party, are slated for such a "goodwill" mission. In fact, the trip has the Conservatives' support, since the Conservatives actually believe it is possible to swing the Chinese Red regime away from the Soviet orbit — in short, they hope that the regime will follow the example of Tito of Yugoslavia. It is reported that Attlee actually discussed the trip with Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden before announcing it.

Harry Bridges: The recent decision of the Supreme Court quashing criminal proceedings by the Department of Justice to deport Harry Bridges for his Communist connections has focused attention on two aspects of the efforts of the government to do something about this labor figure. First is the spectacle of the United States government trying unsuccessfully for some fifteen years to rid the land of a man adjudged by both Executive agencies and Federal courts to have been a tool of the Kremlin and yet boss of one of the nation's most powerful labor unions.

As far back as 1940 a Secretary of Labor sustained a finding by an examiner of the Labor Department that Bridges should be deported for his Red affiliations. An Attorney General of the United States then sustained the Secretary of Labor, and an order deporting Bridges was issued. Then Bridges contested the order in the courts and after protracted proceedings the U.S. Supreme Court in June, 1945, cancelled the deportation order against Bridges on the grounds that the Attorney General had misconstrued the word "affiliation" in a Federal statute and that some evidence had been improperly received.

Immediately Bridges applied for naturalization and in September of '45 was made a naturalized citizen! The government forthwith started after him again — charging him with making false statements to the naturalization authorities. In 1945, Federal law imposing penalties for making false statements to such authority was governed by a Statute of Limitations of five years. In 1948 Congress foolishly amended this Statute of Limitations, cutting it down from five years to three. The government's criminal indictment of Bridges for lying to the naturalization authorities was returned in 1949 — less than *four years* after the commission of his offense. The issue before the Supreme Court in its recent ruling was whether the five year Statute of Limitations (which was in force when Bridges lied) governed or whether the three year Statute did. The highest tribunal held that the latter governed and so Bridges was again let off the hook of deportation although both a Federal District Court and a Federal Appeals Court had sided with the prosecution.

Now the government is making a third try to get Bridges out of the country — a civil suit which has been kept in abeyance while the criminal case was being fought out. In its civil case the government is relying on Federal law which permits revocation of citizenship where it can be established that a naturalized citizen within ten years of his application for citizenship, belonged to an organization advocating the overthrow of the government by force or violence. But the picture of the mighty U.S. government using up more than fifteen years in fruitless efforts to get Harry Bridges out of the country must amuse the Kremlin. Meanwhile, in Washington, the question is asked — Why should there be any Statute of Limitations on perjury committed by an applicant for American citizenship?

Fiscal Legerdemain: The Administration has asked Congress to provide $43,000,000 for grants to states for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration. From 1935-53 the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

states have collected from employers and deposited to their unemployment compensation account with the government in Washington the huge sum of $21,628,000,000. During this period $12,067,000,000 was disbursed back to the states to pay unemployment compensation, leaving a supposed balance of over $9,000,000,000 still in the government's vaults. Why, then, should the Administration be requesting any more money — in this case, the comparatively small sum of $43,000,000 — for unemployment compensation?

Sound fiscal experts say it is necessary because the government hasn't any balance of nine billion dollars in its vaults — that the whole system of unemployment compensation set up by the New Deal was fiscally unsound and essentially dishonest. When the states send in deposits to the government in hard cash they are promptly grabbed by the Treasury Department and used to pay the current costs of the government. In the place of the hard cash, the Treasury Department substitutes government bonds, and as interest accrues on those bonds it is paid by putting in more bonds. Thus the unemployment compensation fund of the states consists only of government I.O.U's. When disbursements are made back to the states, the government has two ways of raising the money: (1) it can ask Congress to appropriate directly the sum needed; (2) or it can sell bonds. In either case the economic effect is to make another set of taxpayers replace it. When government bonds are sold to the public they, of course, have to be ultimately redeemed and that is possible only by taxes.

Thus money collected by the states from employers through special taxation is paid back to the states by collecting the *money all over again* through general taxation by the Federal government. The money raised is in fact collected twice, with the Federal government enjoying the unethical privilege of diverting money raised to pay for unemployment compensation to the current expenses of government. But, say fiscal experts, the system of unemployment compensation was designed to permit the government to spend more than it could otherwise do if elementary accounting ethics were enforced blocking such a diversion of funds. Anyway, there isn't a thin dime of actual cash in those nine billions of the states supposedly on balance with the Federal government.

Disturbing Speculation: Our London sources report that not all is well behind Russia's Iron Curtain — that something may take shape loaded with dynamite for a world that still doesn't understand the trickiness of the Communists. Suppose a "liberation" was staged inside Russia that is faked. (Such an instance occurred this week in Guatemala, in the case of the short-lived "stooge" Diaz government.) It could then be announced to the world that the Communist regime has been overthrown and the press of the world would quite likely roar its approval. A "peace-loving democracy" installed, Moscow could then make the gesture of renouncing the H-bomb, of proclaiming its willingness to disarm, and to entrust the guardianship of peace to a world government.

At any rate the group in England calling itself the "Parliamentary Group for World Government" is becoming unusually vocal and its basic assumption is that Russia must be included in any world government. Once such a government as above described were created, the Communists and socialists of Europe and Asia could contrive our complete socialization as a nation and gain control of our resources and productive power. War between the Soviets and the U.S. would no longer be necessary because we would be firmly enmeshed in a political world of socialism. Our London sources say it would be well to be prepared for any dramatic announcements from Russia in the future, announcements that may conceal a plan to snare our sovereignty by the synthetic picture of a Russia professing readiness to beat her swords into ploughshares.

Booklet Review: *The Story of the Bricker Amendment,* by Hon. Frank E. Holman. Published by the author. Reviewed by Clif Stratton.

An illuminating exposé of how things get done in Washington — and how thereby men and plans get undone — is related in a pamphlet, more properly perhaps booklet, published recently by Frank E. Holman of Seattle, Washington. Mr. Holman, former president of the American Bar Association,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been a leader since 1948 in the fight to end writing of domestic (internal) law thru the treaty-making power of the President and the U.S. Senate — a power apparently now shared by the United Nations and its agencies.

As such, Mr. Holman is in a prime position to relate the key episode — and its constitutional implications — in the gallant fight for the Bricker Amendment.

"On February 25, 1953," relates Mr. Holman, "more than a month after Senator Bricker introduced S.J. Res. 1 calling for a Constitutional Amendment . . . Mr. Schweppe . . . and the writer, had a personal interview with the President of the U.S. on this very question. At that interview the President made two propositions quite clear to us: First, that he was not in favor of treaties or international agreements overriding the Constitution of the United States, and, since under our constitutional procedure the matter of a Constitutional Amendment did not come to his desk for approval or disapproval he saw no reason for taking any position in the matter.

"This view and position of President Eisenhower, as of February 25, 1953, was exactly the position of President Washington during the controversy over the original Bill of Rights. But Washington never changed his position in that regard and never took any part in attempting to influence the legislative procedure leading to the adoption of our original Bill of Rights.

"Nor did Washington protest that the Bill of Rights would tie his hands, altho its purpose and effect was to restrain both the President and the Congress in many vital aspects."

Holman then tells what happened when Eisenhower shifted his position. "Hence it is unfortunate to record — but it must be recorded — that except for the unconstitutional interference of President Eisenhower in a purely legislative process, an adequate Constitutional Amendment for the protection of American rights would have been approved by the Senate of the United States in February, 1954.

"Not only did President Washington very properly take no part in the strictly legislative process of amending the Constitution, but no other President since his time had attempted to interfere actively in this purely legislative matter . . .

"More recently, President Truman refrained from taking any part in the amendment limiting a President of the U.S. to two terms in office — altho this amendment was aimed directly at what occurred under the President's immediate predecessor, who had shattered an unwritten constitutional precedent never violated by earlier Presidents.

"In appraising the situation it should be kept in mind that President Eisenhower went much further than merely expressing his personal opinion. He undertook over and over again to tell the Senate what kind of a Constitutional Amendment he would accept and what kind he would not accept. In attempting to dictate to the Senate thru the device of delivering or addressing these communications to particular Senators who he knew would and did present them to the Senate, he might as well have sent direct and formal messages."

Mr. Holman probably is correct in his sub-title, "The First Phase." Next Congress will find the next phase on its doorstep when it meets to organize, in January, 1955.

Mr. Holman's treatise, *The Story of the Bricker Amendment (First Phase)* was published by Mr. Holman at his own expense. His 5,000 printing has been exhausted. Mr. Holman says that the Committee for Constitutional Government, 205 East 42d Street, New York 17, New York, has taken over publication, and is running off 100,000 this week. $1.00 single copy; 2-8 copies 80¢; 10-25 copies 75¢; larger quantity prices on request.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED